



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/900,384	07/06/2001	Shekhar Kirani	6783P010	7192
8791	7590	03/03/2009	EXAMINER	
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP			BENGZON, GREG C	
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY				
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2444	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/03/2009	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/900,384	KIRANI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	GREG BENGZON	2444	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 December 2008.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                  2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-16, 18-33 and 46-50 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-16, 18-33 and 46-50 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

This application has been examined. Claims 1-16, 18-33, 46-50 are pending.

Claims 17, 34-45, 51 are cancelled.

### ***Making Final***

Applicant's arguments filed 12/17/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Examiner is maintaining the rejection(s) using the same grounds for rejection and thus making this action FINAL.

### ***Priority***

The claimed inventions have been verified with the parent applications 09/588875 filed 6/6/2000 and 60/203407 filed 06/11/2000. The parent applications do not support the claims' subject matter. Hence, they do not entitle this application to a benefit of earliest filling date.

The effective date of the claims described in this application is July 6, 2001.

***Specification***

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required:

Claims 26, 46 recite a limitation "*wherein the generated reference includes transformation parameters that indicate how to transform the particular attachment to the reformatted attachment*".

The Examiner notes that the Applicant Specifications Page 37 Lines 23-28 indicates that the request [not the URL itself] includes the URL and transformation parameters. The Examiner differentiates the said request from the generated reference as described in Applicant Specifications Page 8 Lines 15-20 wherein the generated reference is the aforementioned URL.

The claim or claims must conform to the invention as set forth in the remainder of the specification and *the terms and phrases used in the claims must find clear support or antecedent basis in the description* so that the meaning of the terms in the claims may be ascertainable by reference to the description.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-16, 18-33 and 46-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C, 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rabe-Hesketh et al. (WO 00/72534 Applicant) and Moussa et al. (US Patent 6742043) further in view of Bakshi (US Patent 6311215) further in view of what was well-known in the networking art.

Regarding claims 1 Rabe-Hesketh disclosed a method, apparatus and computer program (collectively referred to as "system") for automatically processing e-mail messages containing attachments, the method comprising: receiving a particular e-mail message having a particular attachment; removing the particular attachment from the particular message based on predefined criteria e.g., size of the attachment; inserting a link into the particular e-mail message, said link capable of referencing the particular attachment that has been removed; in response to invocation of the link by the intended recipient, retrieving a copy of the particular attachment that is automatically formatted based on the specified preference (Rabe-Hesketh - Abstract, Page 3, Lines 25-37; Page 3, Line 24-Page 4, Line 25; Page 5, Line 25-Page 6,Line 25; Page 7, Line 20-Page 11, Line 37).

Rabe-Hesketh does not explicitly disclose specifying a preference for formatting attachments and does not explicitly apply predefined criteria in response to a client's capability, e.g., exceeding client capability. Rabe-Hesketh does not disclose detecting an intended recipient's receiving device during a request from the recipient to retrieve the particular e-mail message and thus formatting attachments accordingly. Rabe-Hesketh does not disclose creating a reformatted attachment based on the specified preference and substituting a link in the email to the reformatted attachment in place of the reformatted attachment

However, in the same field of endeavor, a teaching that has objective akin to Rabe-Hesketh, Moussa teaches a system for communicated media object to an e-mail recipient, which is capable of modifying object format based on specified user preference (Moussa-Column 16 Lines 25-35). Moussa disclosed detecting an intended recipient's receiving device during a request from the recipient to retrieve the particular e-mail message (Moussa-Column 6 Lines 45-65, Column 16 Lines 25-35) and thus formatting attachments accordingly. (Moussa-Column 16 Lines 35-55)

Moussa disclosed creating a reformatted attachment based on the specified preference (Moussa-Column 6 Lines 45-65, Column 16 Lines 25-35).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Rabe-Hesketh by including, the teaching of using user preference and thinning message to accommodate client capabilities as taught by Moussa to enable Rabe-Hesketh's system to provide an object in accordance with user requirement and expand the predefined criteria in Rabe-Hesketh. In doing would enable Rabe-Hesketh's system to enhance its ability and flexibility in providing services to the users that have different levels of resources and capabilities. (Moussa-Column 4 Lines 60-65)

However the combination of Rabe-Hesketh-Moussa does not disclose substituting a link in the email to the reformatted attachment in place of the reformatted attachment.

The Examiner notes that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that the reference link inserted by Rabe-Hesketh has a one-to-one correlation with the original attachment which said link replaces in the email message. Thus, in the combination of Rabe-Hesketh-Moussa where the original attachment is no longer the desired content, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the networking art to substitute a link in the email to the reformatted attachment in place of the reformatted attachment.

Furthermore the combination of Rabe-Hesketh-Moussa does not disclose (re.  
Claim 1) receiving a request for a copy of the reformatted attachment wherein the

*request includes transformation parameters that indicate how to transform the particular attachment to the reformatted attachment.*

Bakshi disclosed (re. Claim 1 ) *receiving a request for a copy of the reformatted attachment wherein the request includes transformation parameters that indicate how to transform the particular attachment to the reformatted attachment.* (Bakshi-Column 2 Lines 65 thru Column 3 Lines 1-25, Column 7 Lines 5-40, Column 7 Lines 60 thru

Column 8 Lines 15)

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to combine Bakshi into Rabe-Hesketh-Moussa. The motivation for said combination would have been to allow network client 12 to receive the correctly-transcoded content even if the HTTP remote proxy 36 to which it is coupled changes due to, for example, a change in geographical location of network client 12 or network load-balancing procedures. (Bakshi- Column 7 Lines 60 thru Column 8 Lines 15)

Claims 4-6, 18, 26, and 46 are rejected on the same basis as Claim 1.

Regarding claims 26 the Examiner notes Rabe-Hesketh-Moussa-Bakshi, in combination with what was well-known in the networking art disclosed ‘generating a reference allowing retrieval of a transformed copy of the detached object’.

The Examiner notes that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art that the reference link inserted by Rabe-Hesketh has a one-to-one correlation with the original attachment which said link replaces in the email message. Thus, in the combination of Rabe-Hesketh-Moussa-Bakshi where the original attachment is no longer the desired content, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the networking art to substitute a link in the email to the reformatted attachment in place of the reformatted attachment.

Furthermore Rabe-Hesketh-Moussa-Bakshi disclosed (re. Claim 46) a transformation module for transforming the objects of the attachment to a desired format, based on capabilities of the target device; (Moussa-Column 6 Lines 45-65, Column 16 Lines 45-65).

Regarding claims 2 and 3, Rabe-Hesketh-Moussa-Bakshi disclosed, preference is associated with a particular user (Moussa-Column 6 Lines 45-65).

Regarding claims 7, 8 and 27, Rabe-Hesketh-Moussa-Bakshi disclosed preference includes specifying that attachments which comprise images be transformed from one file format to another (Moussa-Column 6 Lines 45-65)

Regarding claim 9 and 49, Rabe-Hesketh-Moussa-Bakshi disclosed receiving the particular message at an SMTP server (Rabe-Hesketh, Page 4, Lines 21-26).

Regarding claim 10-11, Rabe-Hesketh-Moussa-Bakshi disclosed removing attachment could be done at anywhere server including a mail server or at MTA, which employed SMTP protocol. (Rabe-Hesketh, Page 4, Lines 21-26)

Implicitly, Rabe-Hesketh-Moussa-Bakshi has readily taught removing an attachment at SMTP server or by the SMTP server.

Regarding claims 12-14, 47-48, Rabe-Hesketh-Moussa-Bakshi disclosed message includes a MIME attachment (Rabe-Hesketh - Page 3, Lines 24-37).

Regarding claims 15 and 33, Rabe-Hesketh-Moussa-Bakshi disclosed link comprises a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) referencing said attachment that has been removed (Rabe-Hesketh Page 6, Lines 2-8; Page 12, Lines 18-30).

Regarding claims 16, 19-20 and 28, Rabe-Hesketh-Moussa-Bakshi disclosed copy of the particular attachment is automatically formatted when a request is received to retrieve the particular attachment (Moussa-Column 6 Lines 45-65)

Regarding claims 21-22, 26,29 , Rabe-Hesketh-Moussa-Bakshi disclosed reformatting resolution, fidelity, color. (Moussa-Column 9 Lines 55-60)

Regarding claims 23, 30, Rabe-Hesketh-Moussa-Bakshi disclosed formatted copies of objects within the particular attachment are stored in a network repository (Rabe-Hesketh Fig. 2, storage 27).

Regarding claim 24, Rabe-Hesketh-Moussa-Bakshi disclosed network repository is accessible by a Web browser for shared access among multiple participants (Rabe-Hesketh Fig4, 48; Fig 5A-5C).

Regarding claims 25, 31 and 32, Rabe-Hesketh-Moussa-Bakshi disclosed attachment includes JPEG-formatted digital images (Moussa-Figure 6).

Rabe-Hesketh-Moussa-Bakshi disclosed (re. Claim 50) wherein said attachment processing module operates as a plug-in module to said e-mail server. (Rabe-Hesketh-  
Page 21 Lines 15-25, Page 22 Lines 30-35)

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 12/17/2008 have been considered but are not persuasive.

The Applicant presents the following argument(s) [*in italics*]:

*...Bakshi discloses configuring a network client, setting transcode preferences for transcoding content and sending these to a network proxy, and then sending a request to download content... Bakshi discloses a two step procedure where the client sets parameters for downloading content, then requesting that content. Bakshi does not teach or suggest including the content transformation parameters in the request for the content. Therefore, Bakshi does not teach or suggest "wherein the request includes transformation parameters that indicate how to transform the particular attachment to the reformatted attachment."*

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant.

Bakshi disclosing *wherein the request includes transformation parameters that indicate how to transform the particular attachment to the reformatted attachment.*

(Bakshi-Column 6 Lines 55-65)

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the characterization of Bakshi as a two-step procedure. As indicated by Bakshi Column 6 Lines 55-65 since the request for content includes transcoding instructions and said instructions are executed automatically upon reception of the data, then Bakshi disclosed a one-step procedure for requesting and transforming the content.

The Examiner respectfully requests further clarification regarding Bakshi's alleged two-step procedure and how the claimed invention is differentiated from Bakshi.

***Conclusion***

**Examiner's Note:** Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Greg Bengzon whose telephone number is (571) 272-3944. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. 8 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Vaughn can be reached on (571)272-3922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/G. B./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2444

/Paul H Kang/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2444

Application/Control Number: 09/900,384  
Art Unit: 2444

Page 14